THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
WASHINGTON, DC

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON
SEPTEMBER 9, 1994, IN LISNER HALL
ROOM 603

The meeting was called to order by President Trachtenberg at 2:15 p.m.

Present: President Trachtenberg, Vice President French, Registrar Gaglione, Parliamentarian (Interim) Hill, Boswell, Brewer, Carson, Castleberry, Eftis, Englander, Fowler, Friedenthal, Frieder, Griffith, Gupta, Harrington, Johnston Kahn, Keimowitz, Kind, Kirsch, Mitchell, Pelzman, Robinson, Salamon, Seavey, K. Smith, P. Smith, Solomon, Thompson, Tropea, and Vontress

Absent: Elgart, Millar, and Miller

In the absence of a Parliamentarian for the 1994-95 Senate Session, Professor Peter P. Hill agreed to serve as Interim Parliamentarian at today's meeting at the request of the President.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting of May, 5, 1994, were approved as distributed.

RESOLUTIONS

I. RESOLUTION 94/1, " A RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE VOLUNTARY RETIREMENT OPPORTUNITIES AND INCENTIVES TO FACULTY"

Professor Gupta, Chair of the Faculty Development and Support Committee, explained that the Committee had spent almost all of the last year working on this issue. In studying the effects of the ending of mandatory retirement, he said that the Committee discovered that academic institutions across the ~~county~~ country were also struggling with this issue and that even the Federal Government was offering "buyouts." Professor Gupta said that, as of January 1, 1994, there is no fixed age retirement for college faculty; however, he said, no academic institution can afford to have on its staff faculty members whose effectiveness may have been compromised. He said there is clearly a need to have some kind of

Corrected 10/14/94

voluntary retirement policy that would be beneficial both to the institution and to the individual faculty member. Upon behalf of the Faculty Development and Support Committee, Professor Gupta then moved the adoption of Resolution 94/1, and the motion was seconded.

Professor Carson asked if the voluntary retirement option was a one-time offering, and Professor Gupta replied that it would be a continuing option. Professor Vontress asked if the Committee had considered the advantages and disadvantages of this encouragement; i.e., it could be a financial advantage to the University to encourage senior faculty to retire early in order to bring in junior faculty, but would it be an academic advantage to the University. Professor Gupta responded that the Committee did consider that there might be some faculty the University would like to discourage from taking early retirement. Professor Mitchell pointed out that in that case the administration could devise attractive incentives to particular senior professors to induce them to stay.

Professor Kirsch asked Professor Gupta if his Committee had done the costing to determine if this plan would be financially advantageous to the University. Professor Gupta replied that that would be a major project which could not be undertaken solely by the Committee because it would require the involvement of many other groups. Professor Kirsch responded that he thought such a study should precede this resolution.

Professor Eftis said he found some ambiguities in the resolution. Since there is no mandatory age limit for retirement, any time a person chooses to retire is voluntary retirement. He asked whether there would be any financial incentives for a faculty member who decided to retire at 77 years of age, for example. Professor Gupta responded that that person could ask the administration what kind of retirement package would be available to him or her.

Professor Griffith said that he thought this resolution was unclear as to what extent it intended to endorse the current policy with respect to retirement, as reflected in the Faculty Handbook, and to what extent it was asking for a change in current policy. He pointed out, for example, the current policy provides that retirement options be available at age 55 after completing 20 years of full-time service or age 60 after completing 10 years of full-time service; but the resolution in Item 2 changes the 10 years of full-time service to 15 years. Professor Griffith said that it is already the case that all faculty members have a voluntary opportunity to make an irrevocable decision to retire from active service, and that incentives, such as post retirement part-time

teaching opportunities, office space, etc., are considered. He said it seemed to him that what is really being asked for are enhancements to faculty who retire before the age of 65. Professor Griffith said that he thought the resolution needed to be much clearer in what it was asking the Senate to do.

Professor Gupta, responding to Professor Griffith's question about Item 2 of the resolution, noted that the number "15" was a typographical error, and that the number "10" was the correct figure.

Professor Gupta said that he agreed with Professor Griffith's suggestion that enhancements should be offered to faculty who retire before the age of 65. Professor Gupta then moved that the Fifth RESOLVING Clause be amended by substituting the word "enhancing" for the word "providing" in the first sentence, so that the same would read: "(5) That consideration be given to <u>enhancing</u> post retirement part-time teaching opportunities, office space, computer and library facilities, continued health insurance premiums and reimbursements for financial planning services to the retiring faculty." The motion was seconded.

Vice President French said that the difficulty in listing several items for enhancements in one clause is that some of these now exist. For instance, office space has been dedicated by some schools for emeriti faculty; general library privileges including electronic access, are provided. On the other hand, Vice President French said that he did not think that departments should be bound to invite all retired faculty to continue teaching as a possibility. Vice President French said that there were a number of factors which were not taken into account in this resolution.

The question was called on the Gupta amendment, and the amendment was adopted unanimously.

Professor Kahn indicated that he did not agree with the specific language of the Resolution. For example, with reference to the Third RESOLVING Clause, Professor Kahn said that he regarded a lump sum severance bonus as an extraordinary limitation, and not a sensible one in view of our tax codes. A payment to be negotiated between the individual faculty member and the administration was really not a stipulation, and should not be left entirely open to an individual negotiation in each case. He said he did not think the full Senate was the place to wordsmith particular phrases, and he, therefore, moved that the resolution be recommitted for clarification. The motion was seconded.

Professor Pelzman spoke in support of the motion to recommit because he had tried himself to figure out exactly what this

resolution meant in terms of dollars and cents. He said that the Senate needed to consider what the objectives are of an early retirement scheme. If it is to encourage people at the last stage of their very productive careers to exit gracefully, that was one thing, but if it is providing incentives to faculty to "steal" from the system by doing their twenty years and then taking a very large ticket out of this big window, that would cost the University a fortune that probably would come out of faculty salaries ultimately.

Professor Mitchell said he also supported the motion to recommit. He said that an early retirement system ought to include a balance of two factors. One is to show compassion to senior faculty who are perhaps leaving the University and to free up University resources to enable it to hire younger, first-rate faculty, and, secondly, an early retirement system cannot be developed without numbers.

Professor Gupta spoke against the recommitment because the Committee was not equipped to carry out the kind of analysis that would provide the specific numbers the Senate wished to have. He said that the Committee did attempt to use all kinds of numbers, but it turned out that the administration was not willing to be tied down to any numbers, so the Committee decided to bring the resolution to the Senate without any numbers.

Professor Kirsch and Professor Griffith both recommended that the resolution be recommitted to the Committee with instructions to the Committee that it request that a Task Force be established to make a financial analysis of data that is necessary to develop an early retirement plan so that everybody will know what the options are.

The question was called on the motion to recommit, and the motion was adopted. (Resolution 94/1 is attached.)

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

No resolutions were introduced.

DISCUSSION OF ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FISCAL PLANNING AND BUDGETING FOR AY 1993-94

On behalf of the Committee on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting, Professor Pelzman, Chair, gave a brief outline of the components of the Report. He reported that the Committee Report was composed of two major portions. The first lists a number of basic facts with which the faculty should become familiar. The second reports on

the current status of faculty participation in the budget planning process. It concludes that "at best" this participation is still at its early developmental stage. As far as the key data points are concerned, the Committee wished to stress that the University is a tuition-dependent institution. He pointed out that most of the numbers in the Report reflected real 1988 dollars that have been adjusted for inflation. He said that real undergraduate net tuition revenue, adjusted for inflation, declined between 1988-93. Currently, the administration was projecting student enrollment where tuition would increase and undergraduate enrollments would remain constant or increase despite the increase in tuition. The assumptions behind these projections need to be discussed. Another area of interest was the disparity in actual tuition payments between graduate and undergraduate students. Undergraduate student revenues are discounted at a much higher rate than graduate tuition. This shifts the burden of rising tuition revenue to graduate students away from undergraduate students. The fact that graduate students were also being shortchanged with respect to poor library facilities and other resources made the tax burden on graduate students even larger. Keep in mind that expenditures on library services have been declining since 1988. This is another issue that the faculty should be concerned with.

Professor Pelzman then expressed his thanks to Vice President Katz and his staff who were very helpful in providing data to the Committee. He noted that Professor Griffith and Professor Solomon, both members of the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee, were present, and that he and Professors Griffith and Solomon would be happy to answer any questions.

Professor Kirsch expressed his concern about the University's ability in the future to carry out its programs and policies, given the decline in tuition revenue in real dollars. Professor Pelzman replied that the component that is generating the decline in real revenue was the discretionary discount factor -- the degree to which tuition for undergraduates was being discounted. He said that there was a level beyond which discounting would not provide any additional improvement in the student characteristics. The discount factor can be lowered, he said, but then the characteristics of the incoming student body will change. Professor Pelzman said he understood that the discount factor was not planned to increase above 42% for 1994-95.

Professor Gupta asked if the discount in the future would be lowered or remain the same. President Trachtenberg replied that the intention, obviously, was to reverse the negative trend, but we live in a contingent world. The administration is looking at several alternative goals at the same time. One was to bring in a quality of student body that would be challenging for our faculty.

We need the faculty for the students, we need the students for the faculty, and we need to be able to pay the one group and to some extent for the other group. And hopefully, he said, a sufficient number of the student body is paying enough of the posted price that it all works out positively at the end. The President said that The George Washington University is in the black and is a financially healthy institution, and that the discount factor was but one snapshot for one portion of a large and complicated budget. Professor Carson commented that, as Chair of the Committee on Admissions Policy, Student Financial Aid, and Enrollment Management last year, the Committee noted that the monies being spent had worked very effectively. The President agreed. He thanked Professor Carson for that endorsement. He further replied that he was going to appoint a Presidential Commission to study the question of enrollment -- what size undergraduate population we wanted and how we wanted them distributed, and what size graduate population we wanted, as the University was moving more and more into a mode of full-time graduate students. He said that all of these issues needed to be looked at within the context of residential facilities, recreational facilities, and academic facilities such as the architecture of our classrooms. He said the University at the present time was very well-positioned, but there was a lot of work to be done in trying to figure out how to maneuver ourselves from where we stand now into the 21st Century.

A discussion followed by Professors Eftis, Pelzman, Mitchell, and President Trachtenberg.

Professor Griffith commended Professor Pelzman for his leadership as Chair of the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee which worked very hard in order to bring this Report to the Senate. Noting that the President rightly called attention to the fact that University is not in a financial deficit, Professor Griffith said he thought it was the responsibility of the faculty to watch out for what might be called "academic" deficits. If one looks at the ways in which the revenue lines play out, one can observe changes in the kinds of students we are attracting, e.g. more full-time graduate students, and undergraduates with higher SAT's, class rankings, etc. And this raises questions for faculty about whether we are able to deliver academically what these students need. For example, when we bring in these overflowing classes, we are forced to hire more and more part-time faculty, and that may create a kind of "academic deficit." Further, it is distressing to see that as the University gets more academically demanding students, and becomes even more revenue dependent on its graduate students, it is simultaneously decreasing its proportionate funding for the Libraries. There are other indications as well of the low priority accorded the Libraries by this Administration. For example, the University was willing to impose a fee on the student body to build

a Wellness Center, but it made a contribution for libraries a voluntary, not standard, fee. And further, it has been two years since the resignation of the University Librarian and we still have an Interim Librarian. Professor Griffith said that if one looks at how the Library, as a central part of the University, is treated, it shows it is not treated nearly as well as it should be. He said he hoped the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee would work with the Libraries Committee to develop some targets as to what the funding for the Library ought to be.

Responding to Professor Griffith's remarks, the President said that the University does need to invest more money in the Library and that additional funding is contemplated. He said that the student body, during the seven years he has been here, has either declined in number or remained flat while the faculty has grown during same period. The increase in freshman students this year was not a calculated outcome. President Trachtenberg said it was the administration's intention next year to be even more stringent in the University's admissions standards to bring in a freshman class that is closer to the intended target because the administration is even more concerned than the faculty, if that is possible, about maintaining GW's reputation for quality instruction. He said the administration did not want to erode the accomplishments the University has made in its student-faculty ratios.

Professor Robinson asked the President what the administration was planning with regard to the Library. The President replied that an emergency appropriation in the amount of $250,000 had already been made to the Library in anticipation of the 1994 freshman class. Additionally, when the administration knows exactly what the enrollment figure is and can determine what resources are available, then, he said, it would be possible to sit down with the academic administrators to discuss the best way of investing those resources in the enhancement of the institution. One target of that investment is the Library.

Professor Pelzman asked the privilege of the floor for Professor Henry Solomon.

Professor Solomon said he wished to make a few comments related to Professor Kirsch's point about concern for the future of the University. In walking around the campus the past two years, Professor Solomon said he perceived a certain kind of hype, i.e., the University has all of these students, the tuition has been increased, and all the money is coming in. He said he thought there are certain questions to be asked. For example, if the University did increase the tuition but did not give 42% financial

assistance, then there would be more money for the institution. Professor Solomon said that, in terms of money, this question is important because the University is forgoing income. What that means for the future is unknown, but it was important to know the reality of what is happening here and what the tradeoffs are.

Further discussion followed by Professors Solomon, Englander, Pelzman, and President Trachtenberg.

GENERAL BUSINESS

I. NOMINATION FOR ELECTION OF FACULTY TO SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

On behalf of the Executive Committee, Professor Robinson moved the nominations of the following faculty: Professors Stuart Umpleby and James Dinwiddie to the Faculty Development and Support Committee; Professor Robert Goulard to the Libraries Committee; Professor Arthur D. Kirsch to the Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies Committee; and Professors Barbara D. Miller and Anthony M. Yezer to the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee. The nominees were elected unanimously.

II. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Report of the Executive Committee by Professor Robinson, Chair, is enclosed.

III. ANNUAL REPORTS OF SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

Annual Reports from the following Senate Committees had been received during the summer and distributed with the agenda for this meeting: Committee on Admissions Policy, Student Financial Aid, and Enrollment Management; Joint Committee of Faculty and Students; and Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, together with Administration Response to Resolutions from the Faculty Senate 1993-94 Term.

Professor Carson, Chair, Committee on Admissions Policy, Student Financial Aid, and Enrollment Management, noted that the Committee was very impressed by the amount of work and strategic planning the administration put into undergraduate enrollment; however, he urged the administration to do the same for graduate enrollment.

Vice President French pointed out that the University has increased financial aid considerably to graduate students, and that

the University's aid "packages" are increasingly competitive. He said that the Presidential Commission intends to study graduate and undergraduate profiles and objectives in a way that he thought would be reassuring to faculty.

BRIEF STATEMENTS (AND QUESTIONS)

President Trachtenberg said that he wished to thank Debbie Masters for the fine work she has done as Interim Librarian for the past two years. He noted that a Search Committee is recruiting candidates for the position of University Librarian, and that he was pleased Ms. Masters is one of those candidates. He hoped that the University would have a Librarian appointed by January 1st, and at that point consultation with the Librarian about long term investing of money in the Library will transpire.

With reference to the 1993-94 Annual Report of the Committee on Admissions Policy, Student Financial Aid, and Enrollment Management, Dean Salamon said she wished to note some incorrect information contained in the concluding paragraph on Page 2 of the Report. A statement is made that budgets for GTF/GTA support appeared too late to offer them for prospective Ph.D. students. Dean Salamon said that her office received preliminary announcements last year no later than December 15th, and firm confirmation of what her GTA budgets would be no later than February 1st. She said that she acted on that basis and she was very pleased with it, and that the central office did not make a mistake.

Professor Kirsch said he wished to compliment the Gelman Library for making available a service called "UnCover Reveal," which provides access to journals through the convenience of a personal E-mail account. This service allows individual users to set up their own profiles and he urged the faculty to take advantage of this service.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion made and seconded, President Trachtenberg adjourned the meeting at 3:50 p.m.

J. Matthew Gaglione

J. Matthew Gaglione
Secretary

[Any inquiries about this resolution should be directed to Professor Murli M. Gupta, Chair of the Committee on Faculty Development and Support 4-4857.]

A RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE VOLUNTARY RETIREMENT OPPORTUNITIES AND INCENTIVES TO FACULTY (94/1)

WHEREAS, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act precludes any fixed age retirement for the University faculty; and

WHEREAS, it is in the mutual interest of both faculty and the University that faculty members retire before their teaching and research effectiveness becomes compromised; and

WHEREAS, it is important to the academic freedom of all faculty that changes in the U.S. law not result in a weakening of the tenure system; and

WHEREAS, it is important that individual faculty members voluntarily determine when they wish to discontinue their active service at the University; NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

(1) That all faculty members have a voluntary opportunity to make an irrevocable decision to retire from active service; and

(2) That the voluntary retirement option be available to all faculty at age 55 after completing 20 years of full time service or at age 60 after completing ~~15~~ 10 years of full time service; and

(3) That the voluntary retirement option be accompanied by a financial incentive in the form of a lumpsum severance bonus to be negotiated between the individual faculty member and the administration; and

(4) That the administration consider providing a partial retirement option prior to or in conjunction with the voluntary retirement; and

(5) That consideration be given to ~~providing~~ enhancing post retirement part-time teaching opportunities, office space, computer and library facilities, continued health insurance premiums and reimbursements for financial planning services to the retiring faculty; and

(6) That a voluntary retirement option be made available and known to the faculty of the University.

Committee on Faculty Development and Support
Approved April 19, 1994

Recommitted, 9/9/94

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
SEPTEMBER 9, 1994
PROFESSOR LILIEN F. ROBINSON, CHAIR

On behalf of the Executive Committee, I would like to report on the following matters.

I. GRIEVANCES

(1) The Executive Committee appointed Professor Robert Park of the National Law Center as Special Mediator in a grievance from the School of Medicine and Health Sciences.

(2) A grievance from the School of Education and Human Development, previously reported upon, continues in the formal grievance stage.

(3) In a grievance from the School of Engineering and Applied Science, the Executive Committee has appointed Professor Carol Izumi of the National Law Center, as Special Mediator.

II. NONCONCURRENCES

(1) An administrative nonconcurrence in Columbian College and Graduate School of Arts and Sciences was received by the Executive Committee this past May. A hearing was held by the Executive Committee; the case is currently in progress.

(2) Three potential nonconcurrences in the School of Medicine and Health Sciences were received by the Executive Committee during the spring and summer. Two of these cases have been resolved; the third is still pending.

III. UPDATE ON DEVELOPMENT OF ALTERNATIVE APPEALS PROCESS FOR HANDLING NONCONCURRENCES

Work on the matter of an alternative appeals process for handling nonconcurrences was continued over the summer. The following changes were made to the membership of the Ad Hoc Committee. Professor Kahn, Chair of the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee, and Professor Lobuts, member of the same Committee, were appointed to replace Professor Cohn and Professor Henig, both of whom are no longer members of the PEAF Committee. The Executive Committee also appointed Professor Pelzman to replace one of the Executive Committee representatives, Professor Holmes, who is no longer a member of the Executive Committee, and Professor Harrington who replaced Professor Johnston, who resigned his position.

Currently, the Ad Hoc Committee, in concert with the Executive Committee, is in the process of framing a response to a memorandum recently received from Vice President French. I anticipate that we will be providing a full report on the above at the October meeting. I am hopeful that we will also have a resolution with respect to an alternative appeals process for handling nonconcurrences at that time.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS

(1) The President has responded to Faculty Senate Resolutions of the 1993-94 Session. Received on August 22, 1994, this document was distributed with the Faculty Senate agenda.

(2) An updated membership list of Senate Standing Committees will be distributed with the minutes. This list will reflect any changes in the membership since May, 1994.

(3) The next meeting of the Executive Committee is Thursday, September 22, 1994, to set the agenda for the October 14th Senate meeting. Please note that any items of business for the Senate agenda should be received by the Executive Committee before September 22nd.

Thank you.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, DC

The Faculty Senate August 29, 1994

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, September 9, 1994 at 2:10 p.m. in Lisner Hall 603.

AGENDA

1. Call to order

2. Approval of the minutes of the regular meeting of May 5, 1994

3. Resolutions:

   A RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE VOLUNTARY RETIREMENT OPPORTUNITIES AND INCENTIVES TO FACULTY (94/1) with accompanying Report; Professor Murli M. Gupta, Chair, Faculty Development and Support Committee (Resolution 94/1 with Report attached)

4. Introduction of Resolutions

5. Discussion of Annual Report of the Committee on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting for AY 1993-94; Professor Joseph Pelzman, Chair, Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee (Report previously distributed with the May 5, 1994, Senate minutes)

6. General Business:

   (a) Nomination for election of the following faculty to Senate Standing Committees: Professors Stuart Umpleby and James Dinwiddie to the Faculty Development and Support Committee; Professor Robert Goulard to the Libraries Committee; Professor Arthur D. Kirsch to the Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies Committee; and Professors Barbara D. Miller and Anthony M. Yezer to the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee

   (b) Report of the Executive Committee: Professor Lilien F. Robinson, Chair

   (c) Annual Reports (1993-94 Session): Committee on Admissions Policy, Student Financial Aid, and Enrollment Management; Joint Committee of Faculty and Students; and Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, together with Administration Response to Resolutions from the Faculty Senate-1993-94 Term (Reports attached)

7. Brief Statements (and Questions)

8. Adjournment

J. Matthew Gaglione
Secretary

[Any inquiries about this resolution should be directed to Professor Murli M. Gupta, Chair of the Committee on Faculty Development and Support 4-4857.]

A RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE VOLUNTARY RETIREMENT OPPORTUNITIES AND INCENTIVES TO FACULTY (94/1)

WHEREAS, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act precludes any fixed age retirement for the University faculty; and

WHEREAS, it is in the mutual interest of both faculty and the University that faculty members retire before their teaching and research effectiveness becomes compromised; and

WHEREAS, it is important to the academic freedom of all faculty that changes in the U.S. law not result in a weakening of the tenure system; and

WHEREAS, it is important that individual faculty members voluntarily determine when they wish to discontinue their active service at the University; NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

(1) That all faculty members have a voluntary opportunity to make an irrevocable decision to retire from active service; and

(2) That the voluntary retirement option be available to all faculty at age 55 after completing 20 years of full time service or at age 60 after completing 15 years of full time service; and

(3) That the voluntary retirement option be accompanied by a financial incentive in the form of a lumpsum severance bonus to be negotiated between the individual faculty member and the administration; and

(4) That the administration consider providing a partial retirement option prior to or in conjunction with the voluntary retirement; and

(5) That consideration be given to providing post retirement part-time teaching opportunities, office space, computer and library facilities, continued health insurance premiums and reimbursements for financial planning services to the retiring faculty; and

(6) That a voluntary retirement option be made available and known to the faculty of the University.

Committee on Faculty Development and Support
Approved April 19, 1994

Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Development and Support

Voluntary Retirement Opportunities and Incentives

The 1978 amendments to Age Discrimination in Employment Act raised the mandatory retirement age for college faculty from 65 to 70. In 1986, U.S. Congress passed further amendments that eliminated ("uncapped") the mandatory retirement altogether, effective January 1, 1994. Universities and colleges nationwide have been examining ways of responding to the challenge of no mandatory retirement for their faculty. At The George Washington University, the Faculty Senate made an effort in this direction by adopting Resolution 90/15 on April 12, 1991 that asked the Vice President for Academic Affairs to direct each school to devise plans to facilitate the voluntary retirement of senior faculty.

In response to Faculty Senate Resolution 90/15, the Administration set up a Task Force on Post Tenure Evaluation of Continuing Faculty. The recommendations of this Task Force, though technically withdrawn, were the subject of a heated debate in the Faculty Senate during February of last year and resulted in the adoption of Resolution 92/4 which reaffirmed the principles of tenure and academic freedom, and rejected the imposition of additional peer review of tenured faculty; the Senate also opposed "threats or processes of harassment to 'encourage' retirement of faculty."

Early in the current academic year, the Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Development and Support invited Vice-President French to discuss the issue of early retirement at GW and to begin a dialogue. Dr. French informed the committee that he has been talking to an average of 2 faculty members per month about early or partial retirement and that the University enters into about 8 such arrangements each year. The committee discussed the needs of the retired faculty, the vitality of existing faculty, the proverbial "deadwood", and the nexus between "early retirement" and post-tenure evaluation.

There is a widespread concern, nationwide, that with an aged, top heavy faculty, the younger faculty would have fewer opportunities for tenured positions [Voluntary Incentive Early Retirement Programs, TIAA/CREF *Research Dialogues*, July 1988]. It is of interest to note that in order to reduce the size of the government without resorting to layoffs, the federal agencies recently began to offer a Voluntary Separation Incentive Payments (Buyouts) program that allows a federal employee of 12 months service the lesser of $25,000 or his/her severance pay entitlement [*Washington Post*, March 28, 1994, p. A19].

The Committee met several times to consider the incentives for voluntary retirement of active senior faculty. The present practice has been that any faculty member may approach his/her chair, dean and the Vice President for Academic Affairs (or the VPAA directly) to negotiate an early retirement package. The committee believes that there ought to be broad guidelines that are available and known to all faculty contemplating

retirement. It has been pointed out that many faculty members considering possible retirement would wish to maintain academic relationship with the University and would appreciate the availability of office space, secretarial assistance and part-time teaching privileges at better than the current part-time rates. The other consideration is the possible transition from full time to part time status prior to voluntary retirement.

The Committee discovered that the University of Chicago has recently adopted and implemented a voluntary retirement plan that provides a "window period" during which the eligible faculty members make an irrevocable decision to retire from active service and receive financial incentives based upon an announced formula. The Committee had access to the Chicago report, Report of the Task Force on Faculty Retirement (November 1992) as well as the implementation documents dated July 2, 1993 from the University of Chicago. It is felt that a comparable project at GWU could not be undertaken solely by our committee; such a project would require much broader involvement of many other groups such as the ASPP Committee, Budget Review Committee, Administration and Board of Trustees. However, the Committee is convinced that there is a need to have a voluntary, without coercion of any sort, retirement plan that is known and available to all faculty members.

There is agreement that any retirement proposal should be voluntarily initiated by the faculty members. Once a faculty member declares his/her intent to retire from the University, and negotiates and accepts a severance package, the intent becomes irrevocable. The present 'early retirement' policy at GWU allows a faculty member to retire at age 55 after 20 years service or at age 60 after 10 years service. The committee believes this should continue to be the policy for voluntary retirement.

In recent years, many faculty members contemplating early retirement have approached the administration and worked out individual packages of benefits, some involving lumpsum payments and others providing payments spread over a number of years. The Committee knows of a number of cases where the recently retired faculty members were unaware that they could have approached the administration and worked out an individual package for themselves. The Committee believes that, in fairness to all faculty members, the availability of financial incentives on voluntary retirement should be known to all faculty members. In fact, the present resolution merely recapitulates the present practice at GWU with one change: it alerts the faculty to their opportunities for negotiating a satisfactory retirement package for themselves.

Under the new policy at the University of Chicago, each faculty member taking advantage of the voluntary opportunities is offered reimbursements, up to $3000, for financial planning services within 12 months of declaring their intent to retire. The Committee recommends that provision of financial planning services by an outside counsellor be considered as a fringe benefit for all faculty approaching retirement.

Many faculty members approaching retirement wish to continue their teaching and/or

research activities at the university. For them it is important to have office space, and continued access to secretarial, computer and library facilities. The Committee recommends the university provide a central space, if not possible within departments or schools, for emeriti faculty. The possibility of providing part-time opportunities to the retired faculty should also be considered insofar they meet the departmental needs. Consideration should be given to provide such teaching opportunities at better than part-time rates.

The continued availability of health insurance is an important factor in consideration of retirement by faculty members and their spouses. Under the new policy at the University of Chicago, the University pays *lifetime* premiums for each participating faculty member and spouse for university sponsored health insurance that supplements Medicare. While the enactment of Health Care Reform legislation may make this consideration moot, it is recommended that The George Washington University consider providing increased health insurance benefits to retired faculty and continue them beyond age 70.

The George Washington University presently provides educational benefits to retired faculty members and their eligible dependents. The committee recommends that this practice should continue unchanged.

The Committee also considered the availability of a partial retirement option prior to full retirement and recommends that GWU develop phased retirement policies that would allow the faculty members to declare irrevocable intent to retire after a number of years (to be negotiated between the faculty member and the administration). During the intervening years, the faculty members would continue to work at less than full time (1/2 or 2/3) effort. At the end of the negotiated period of partial retirement, the faculty member would retire and be eligible to obtain the negotiated retirement benefits.

Committee on Faculty Development and Support
April 19, 1994

1993-94 Annual Report

Committee on Admissions Policy, Student Financial Aid, and Enrollment Management

INTRODUCTION

The committee met several times during the 93-94 academic year. The first activity was to understand the administrative structure dealing with admissions and financial aid. New to the related administrative structure this year are **Daniel Small**, Director Enrollment Management Administration and **Donald Leaman**, Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies. We were unable to obtain any written documentation explaining the organization and structure of Rice Hall in these areas but obtained verbal descriptions of their activities from the persons involved.

Based on these interviews and presentations it was clear that the committee name and charter did not correspond to the University's organizational structure nor the actual interrelationships between the areas of admissions, financial aid and enrollment management. Accordingly, a title change for the committee was proposed to the Faculty Senate and approved.

UNDERGRADUATE ISSUES

Overall, our impression of the undergraduate enrollment support was favorable. Certainly, the documentation demonstrates increasing SAT scores and strong enrollments for the University. We were surprised, however, by the lack (or unavailability) of a strategic plan for enrollment. While a comprehensive description of such a plan was presented verbally, it would be useful for such a plan to be publicized to the faculty.

We also noted, that where some individual Schools within the University had decreases in enrollment quality or quantity, some efforts were being made to focus recruiting to aid those schools.

We were very pleased with the results of the merit scholarship programs. The extremely high retention rate for these scholars was very impressive.

GRADUATE ISSUES

The graduate admissions activity, unlike the undergraduate, is distributed to the various schools and colleges involved. The committee believes this to be appropriate although one of the end results of this distribution is less "attention" (and perhaps support) provided by the University for graduate programs. For schools such as SBPM, where a large percentage of students are graduate students and where the School receives a low return on its generated tuition, the lack of a comprehensive graduate level admissions and financial aid plan is harmful. It was drawn to this committees attention in Spring 1993, that the University, for the first time, had learned how and where money for graduate teaching and research support were allocated.

Although the various colleges and schools seem well able to handle their admissions and recruiting process, graduate financial aid seems to be suffering a lack of "common sense" from Rice Hall. The following portion is based on discussions with individuals in SBPM and may not be applicable elsewhere in the University. Departments in SBPM are being instructed to use their resources more effectively while at the same time, they are unable to provide the same level of GTA and GTF

support as was done previously. One of the reasons for this is that the University is now treating GTA/GTA tuition stipends as "real money" where they apparently had not done so in the past. However, the result of this is that some departments will have to actually spend more money to cover laboratory sessions and recitations by hiring adjunct faculty rather than employing GTA support. While the University seems willing to employ merit scholarships to increase the quality of undergraduate students, it is seriously neglecting the graduate area. GTF/GTA support is the most cost effective way to lure top quality students to the University and an extremely cost effective method of providing teaching support for undergraduate labs and recitations. Additionally, with budgets for these areas appearing so late, it is impossible to offer prospective Ph.D. students such assistantships in a time frame that will affect their enrollment decision. This area clearly needs additional support and some serious reconsideration by the administration.

Submitted,

John H. Carson, Chair

ANNUAL REPORT
JOINT COMMITTEE OF FACULTY AND STUDENTS
July, 1994

The JCFS met seven times in the 1993-94 academic year during the months of September, October, December, January, February, March and April. Chairing was rotated between the student and faculty co-chairs, and several members shared minute-taking. During the academic year, the following were the most salient matters brought before the committee.

1. Academic Dishonesty. (Sometimes referred to as Honor Code Committee) met frequently and began to finalize the work initiated in the previous year. There was much discussion of issues, including the place of an Honor Code in the Code of Student Conduct. Professor Kirkland and Scott Mory incorporated a survey into their feasibility study. The results of that survey are in the March 25, 1994 minutes of the JCFS as well as in the more detailed memo by the co-chairs of this subcommittee Professor Kirkland and Scott Mory (May 1, 1994).

Result of subcommittee work: A working draft is now in existence, and the subcommittee expects to complete its work in the 94-95 academic year.

2. Review Process of Academic Dishonesty. Related to the Academic Dishonesty issue is the discussion of the decision by the Board of Trustees to opt out of the review process. While the committee agreed to the temporary solution proposed by Vice President French in an amendment to the Guide to Student Rights and Responsibilities, (See French's memo dated 2/14/94) it objected in principle to the manner in which the Board of Trustees made its decision

Result of discussion. Yvonne Captain, faculty co-chair sent a response memo to Vice President French (3/30/94). However, the JCFS decided against adopting a resolution to protest the Board's decision.

3. Stipends and Awards. The primary business of this ongoing committee is to review the awards process in general and to determine the success of the student stipend awards that were instituted on a trial basis in 1990. In addition, a continuing concern among the student members of the JCFS is the understanding of how Student Leadership Awards are decided.

Result. The Stipends and Awards committee will continue to meet in academic year 1994-95 to discuss the above.

4. Mission Statement. A subcommittee met several times and presented its findings to the entire JCFS. After some revisions, the final draft of the Statement received approval and was forwarded to the Executive Committee via memo of February 25, 1994.

Result. Final Mission Statement in hands of Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.

5. Student involvement on Faculty Senate Standing Committees. Per Professor Schiff's concerns about lack of participation of students on his Faculty Senate committee during academic year 93-94, a discussion began on 1) student apathy on committees, 2) which Faculty Senate committees were best suited for student involvement.

Result. A memo urging student involvement on Faculty Senate Committees was sent to the chair of the Executive Committee in August, 1994

6. Dean's Search Committee. Interest in this committee did not continue from the previous year.

Result. Due to lack of student involvement, this committee was disbanded.

7. Continuity from one year to the next. It is apparent that one perennial concern for the JCFS is the issue of continuity--both in terms of the membership of the JFCS and with regard to various subcommittees within the JCFS. The lack of continuity has caused repetitions and reinventions of previous work.

Result. LeNorman Strong has agreed to allow his office to serve as a repository for all records of the JCFS, dating back to the inception of this committee in 1970. Yvonne Captain is seeking the records of all past faculty co-chairs in this effort.

It is anticipated that the following will occupy the committee for the 1994-95 academic year: Academic Dishonesty, Stipends and Awards, Student Participation on Faculty Senate Standing Committees.

Official and ex-officio members who were active on the committee this year (attending at least three meetings or working on subcommittees) were: Jessica Arneson, Cheryl Beil, Yvonne Captain, Linda Donnels, Margaret Kirkland, Jeff Korte (for LeNorman Strong), Scott Mory, Joan Regnell, Sue Walitsky, and Harry Yeide.

submitted by Yvonne Captain
7/94

ANNUAL REPORT OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

1993-1994 SESSION

The Executive Committee arranged the agenda for eight regular meetings of the Faculty Senate during the 1993-1994 Session. Additionally, it arranged one Special Meeting. A tabulation of resolutions considered and passed by the Senate is attached. The response of President Trachtenberg will be distributed when available.

The Executive Committee referred a variety of matters for consideration and action to standing committees, including: study of administrative operating and salary expenditures; review of University policy on "early tenure"; review of changes in the Medical Center's sabbatical leave compensation; revision to the academic dishonesty policy. The Special Committee reviewing Senate representation and terms continued its work. An Ad Hoc Committee, established by the Executive Committee, began the work of reviewing the role of Department Chairs.

In June 1993, in accordance with the Faculty Code, the Executive Committee was notified of two administration nonconcurrences in the School of Engineering and Applied Science and one nonconcurrence in the Columbian College and Graduate School of Arts and Sciences.

In the first case in the School of Engineering, the Dean withdrew his nonconcurrence subsequent to presentations by the Dean and Department to the Executive Committee. In the second Engineering School case, the Executive Committee advised that the Dean had presented "compelling" reasons and had provided "supporting reasons." The Department declined to withdraw its recommendation, and the case was forwarded to the Board of Trustees; the latter sustained the administration nonconcurrence.

In the nonconcurrence in the Arts and Sciences, subsequent to the Executive Committee's recommendation that the Dean withdraw her nonconcurrence, negotiations between the Department and Administration resulted in a resolution acceptable to both parties.

In May 1994, the Executive Committee was notified of one additional administration nonconcurrence in the Columbian College and Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. This case is currently in process.

The Executive Committee received the following faculty grievances: two from the School of Engineering and Applied Science, two from the Medical School, and one from the School of Education. In each of the cases, the Executive Committee made

inquiries, and in four cases it appointed a Special Mediator.

In one case in the Engineering School, discussions with the Administration are still in process. In the second Engineering School case, a resolution was reached. In one Medical School case, resolution was obtained, while mediation is in process in the second case. The grievance in the School of Education has entered the hearing stage.

Over the course of the year, the Chair of the Executive Committee has also discussed potential grievances with ten faculty members throughout the University. Some of these discussions are ongoing.

Requests for advice/action forwarded to the Executive Committee during the 1993-1994 Session included the following.

In a memorandum of April 29, 1993, Vice President French requested the Executive Committee's advice with respect to decisions on four faculty tenure recommendations in the School of Engineering and Applied Science. He indicated that, in light of the financial situation in the School, the Administration had concluded that it could not afford to grant additional tenure at the present time. Viewing any negative Administration decision as a nonconconcurrence with faculty recommendations, the Executive Committee determined that it would be inappropriate for the Executive Committee to extend advice on cases that may come before it. The matter was reported at the May 6, 1993, Senate meeting. The Administration subsequently decided to grant tenure to all the faculty concerned.

The Executive Committee received an inquiry from Professor William B. Griffith with respect to the existence of an Administration policy of financially penalizing academic departments found to have been at fault in litigation. Although the Executive Committee had a preliminary discussion of this subject with the Academic Vice President, a meeting with University legal officers is being arranged through Vice President French.

The Executive Committee was notified by memorandum of October 29, 1993, from President Trachtenberg of two resolutions passed by the Board of Trustees, changing the process for handling disputed academic dishonesty cases and disputed faculty personnel recommendations. Through these resolutions the Board indicated it would no longer serve as the final appeals body.

The Executive Committee transmitted the resolution on academic dishonesty to the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students for response and recommendation, while bringing the resolution on nonconcurrences (disputed faculty personnel recommendations) to the

Faculty Senate. Responding to both substance and process (i.e., absence of consultation with faculty) the Senate requested, by unanimous vote, that the Board rescind its resolution. That request, along with the Executive Committee's request for a meeting with the Board of Trustees' Executive Committee, was transmitted.

At the invitation of the Chair of the Board of Trustees, Professors Gerald P. Johnston and Lilien F. Robinson made a presentation on behalf of the Executive Committee.

On February 10, 1994, the Board of Trustees passed a second resolution indicating its desire to be removed from the nonconcurrence process and calling upon the Faculty and Administration to develop an appropriate process, considering all alternatives, except external arbitration.

Accordingly, the Senate Executive Committee appointed Professors Victor H. Cohn, Jeffrey R. Henig, Dennis H. Holmes, Gerald P. Johnston, and Lilien F. Robinson to an Ad Hoc Committee. Vice President Roderick S. French appointed Deans Jack H. Friedenthal and Linda B. Salamon to the Committee. At the request of the Executive Committee, Vice President French joined the Ad Hoc Committee.

The Ad Hoc Committee has held five meetings, two of which were also attended by President Trachtenberg.

Additionally, the Executive Committee arranged for a Special Senate Meeting on March 25, 1994, to obtain guidance from the Senate with respect to an acceptable process for handling nonconcurrences. The Senate took the position and reconfirmed it (April 8, 1994) by resolution that any final appeals process must end with the faculty.

At the request of the Executive Committee, Senate representatives reported back to their respective schools, soliciting responses and suggestions.

In view of the fact that discussions of the Ad Hoc Committee were still in process at the time of the last meeting of the Senate, the Executive Committee of the Board extended the deadline for submission of a report. It is the understanding of the Senate Executive Committee that the expectation of the Board of Trustees is that a report be presented for its October, 1994 meeting.

The 1993-1994 Session of the Faculty Senate has considered and dealt with matters central to the success of faculty governance

at the University. The Executive Committee is exceedingly grateful to Faculty Senate members and colleagues throughout the University for their hard work, dedication and support. The Committee also extends special thanks to the Faculty Senate Office and especially to Ms. Doris Trone for her effective and conscientious assistance in the work of the Senate.

Respectfully submitted.

Lilien F. Robinson
Chair, Executive Committee of the
Faculty Senate

Members of the Executive Committee:

John G. Boswell
Mervyn L. Elgart
Ernest J. Englander
Robert J. Harrington
Gerald P. Johnston
Joseph Pelzman

ex officio:

Stephen Joel Trachtenberg, President

FACULTY SENATE

RESOLUTIONS 93-94 SESSION

Resolution No.	Date of Meeting	Title of Resolution	Action	Remarks and/or Committee Referral Response of the Administration
93/1	5/6/93	A Resolution on a Mandatory Mid-Semester Academic Warning System	Adopted 5/6/93	
93/2	5/6/93	A Resolution to Commend The George Washington University Men's Basketball Team	Adopted 5/6/93	
93/3	5/6/93	A Resolution to Commend The George Washington University Grounds Department	Adopted 5/6/93	
93/4	12/10/93	A Resolution to Recommend the Establishment of a Joint Faculty-Administrion Task Force to Assess the Long-Run Comparative Advantage of the Virginia Campus (Substitute)	Adopted 12/10/93	
93/5	1/21/94 (Cancelled)	A Resolution on Grading Extensions	Postponed to 2/11/94	The January 21st and February 11th Senate meetings were postponed due to snow and ice storms; all items of business were postponed to the February 18th meeting.
	2/11/94 (Cancelled)	Resolution 93/5 (noted above)	Postponed to 2/18/94	
	2/18/94	Resolution 93/5 (noted above)	Adopted, as amended, 2/18/94	
93/6	3/11/94	A Resolution on the Active Participation of the Faculty in University Governance (Substitute)	Adopted, as amended, 3/11/94	
93/7	4/7/94	A Resolution to Change the Name and Scope of the Standing Committee on Admissions Policy and Student Financial Aid	Adopted 4/8/94	

(continued)

FACULTY SENATE

RESOLUTIONS 93-94 SESSION

Resolution No.	Date of Meeting	Title of Resolution	Action	Remarks and/or Committee Referral Response of the Administration
93/8	4/8/94	A Resolution on the Faculty Senate's Support for the GWU Green Model University Task Force	Adopted 4/8/94	
93/9	4/8/94	A Resolution on the Process of Handling Administrative Nonconcurrences with Faculty Personnel Recommendations	Adopted, as amended 4/8/94	
93/10	4/8/94	A Resolution of Appreciation for Professor Victor H. Cohn	Adopted by Acclamation 4/8/94	

Administration Response to Resolutions from the Faculty Senate

1993-94 Term

Resolution 93/1:	*A Resolution on a Mandatory Mid-Semester Academic Warning System*
Response:	**Accepted and communicated to the Deans for implementation.**
Resolution 93/2:	*A Resolution to Commend The George Washington University Men's Basketball Team*
Response:	**Accepted and communicated to the Athletic Department.**
Resolution 93/3:	*A Resolution to Commend The George Washington University Grounds Department*
Response:	**Accepted and communicated to the Grounds and Maintenance Department.**
Resolution 93/4:	*A Resolution to Recommend the Establishment of a Joint Faculty-Administration Task Force to Assess the Long-Run Comparative Advantage of the Virginia Campus (Substitute)*
Response:	**Acknowledged; awaiting report.**
Resolution 93/5:	*A Resolution on Grading Extensions*
Response:	**Accepted and communicated to the Deans and the Registrar.**
Resolution 93/6:	*A Resolution on the Active Participation of the Faculty in University Governance (Substitute)*
Response:	**(1) Accepted with the understanding that the Faculty Code takes precedence over the ordinances or by-laws of an individual school which may be contrary to or go beyond Code.**

(2) We understand this to be a procedural rather than a substantive change in that, in the past, the consultation requirements were satisfied by meetings and now would require a written statement with opportunity provided for a formal response. This formal response not to be unreasonably delayed or withheld.

Resolution 93/7: *A Resolution to Change the Name and Scope of the Standing Committee on Admissions Policy and Student Financial Aid*

Response: **Noted.**

Resolution 93/8: *A Resolution on the Faculty Senate's Support for the GWU Green Model University Task Force*

Response: **Noted.**

Resolution 93/9: *A Resolution on the Process of Handling Administrative Non-concurrences with Faculty Personnel Recommendations*

Response: **A new proposal from the Administration will be in the hands of the Executive Committee before the first meeting of the full Senate.**

Resolution 93/10: *A Resolution of Appreciation for Professor Victor H. Cohn*

Response: **The Administration associates itself with the Senate in its sentiments.**